DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 606 IR 054 016

AUTHOR Meyer, Linda; Wood, Richard J.
TITLE Library Staff Evaluations and Merit Pay Decisions: A Case Study.
INSTITUTION Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Case Studies; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Problems; Higher Education; Job Performance Evaluation; *Library Administration; *Library Personnel; *Library Standards; *Personnel Evaluation; Specifications
IDENTIFIERS Sam Houston State University TX

ABSTRACT

Because of support staff dissatisfaction with Sam Houston State University library's evaluation and merit system, the Director initiated a staff evaluation committee which reviewed current evaluation practices, drafted a new evaluation instrument, and revised the evaluation process. The factors which were involved in this evaluation process are described in this paper as well as the three sections of the new evaluation instrument: (1) Section 1, in which all job criteria apply to all staff and receive equal weights of 10 each for a total of 350; (2) Section 2 in which staff weight only those criteria that apply to their own jobs; and (3) Section 3, in which the staff notes their accomplishments, library and university committees, training, workshops attended, and any other pertinent information such as related community work. How these criteria are scored, and by whom, is also described. The impact of the new instrument on staff morale is noted, and an informal survey conducted to determine staff attitudes toward the old and new evaluation instruments is described. A summary of the survey results is given, and it is concluded that the new evaluation instrument is more highly favored. Copies of both the old form and the current form are appended. (NAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ED
Office of Educational Research a
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES DUCATION
CENTER (ERIC) and Improvement
INFORMATION
☐ This document has been
received from the person
originating it reproduced as
☐ Minor changes have been m or organization
reproduction quality made to improve
Points of view or opinions sta
ment do not necessarily re
OERI position or policy ated in this docu-
epresent official

ED344606

Library Staff Evaluations and Merit Pay Decisions: A Case Study

by
Linda Meyer
Library Assistant

and

Richard J. Wood, Ph.D.
Director of Library Services

February, 1992

Newton Gresham Library
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341

IR054016

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard J. Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Preface	3
The Setting	4
Introduction	5
The "old" and the "new" systems	7
The new evaluation instrument	10
Implementation and assessment	15
Summary	22
Appendix A The "old" evaluation instrument	24
Appendix B The "new" evaluation instrument	32

ABSTRACT

Although no employee evaluation instrument may ever be regarded by all employees as perfect in any institution, Newton Gresham Library support staff expressed their feelings of dissatisfaction with the evaluation and merit system in use at Sam Houston State University to the newly appointed Director in 1990. After discussing those concerns with them and determining a method to review current practices, the Director initiated a committee structure by which staff could review current evaluation practices and draft a new instrument and evaluation process.

This staff evaluation committee reviewed some of the literature on the subject, studied other employee evaluation instruments used by other institutions, conducted a survey of librarians and support staff, and listened to their comments and suggestions both formally and informally before arriving at its final draft of the instrument which has been in use since early 1991. The authors, the Director and the chair of the staff evaluation committee, discuss all of these factors in this paper. Further, they describe the instrument which is composed of three sections:

- Section One in which all job criteria apply to all staff and receive equal weights of ten each for a total of 350;

- Section Two in which staff weight only those criteria that apply to their jobs; and,

- Section Three in which the staff note accomplishments, library and university committees, training, workshops attended, and any other pertinent information such as related community work.

How these criteria are scored, by whom, is also described. Copies of the forms used now and in the past are also included.

Finally, the authors note what impact the new instrument has had on staff morale. An informal survey was made of the staff to determine their attitudes toward the old and new evaluation instruments. The authors summarize the results which favor the new instrument.

PREFACE

Industry, government, business, and education have spent millions of dollars each in trying to develop employee evaluation systems. From one company or entity to another, and over any long period of time, we find a variety of forms, procedures, criteria, and policies because no one of them has proven acceptable to employee groups or employers. At any level--national, state, regional or local--the differences in evaluation systems seem to be as diverse as the institutions themselves. Evaluation instruments or policies, and attitudes about them, are sometimes altered as frequently as are the CEO's, presidents, directors, or supervisors.

This paper describes a successful attempt in the early 1990's to develop and implement an employee evaluation system for library staff at Newton Gresham Library, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. The authors describe and evaluate each of the components and offer reasons for changing the system.

The authors believe that this case study makes a valuable contribution to the library literature because the system was developed with the full involvement of the library administration, librarians, and library staff. The authors hope that other library administrators, librarians, and library staff in other institutions will find the information helpful.

THE SETTING

Sam Houston State University (SHSU), established in 1879 and located in Huntsville, Texas, is the third oldest state-assisted university in the state. Huntsville is a town of about 20,000 persons located 70 miles north of Houston in the piney woods of east Texas.

Now in its 113th year, SHSU was originally created to train teachers for Texas public schools, and has been recognized as the oldest teacher training institution west of the Mississippi. During the 1970s, the institution evolved into a university rooted in the liberal arts. Academic instruction is provided by more than 450 faculty to over 12,700 students in one of four colleges: Education, Applied Science, Business Administration and Criminal Justice. The university currently offers 96 undergraduate degree programs, 79 graduate degree programs, and the doctor of philosophy degree in criminal justice. The College of Criminal Justice, the nation's largest single facility dedicated to criminal justice education, has received international recognition for its leading role in criminal justice instruction.

Newton Gresham Library (NGL), which has been cited for its extensive holdings and collections, is a modern facility which employs twelve librarians, twenty six staff and the Director. NGL offers students and faculty a collection of over 750,000 volumes, 650,000 microforms, and

70,000 government documents. The library also provides a number of automated services: networked CD-ROM databases, online searches; OCLC access for reference, interlibrary loan and cataloging; the Data Research Associates integrated, online system, and an electronic serials control system. A Learning Assistance Center, housed in the library, serves students who need remedial assistance in developmental reading, writing, and mathematics courses. Additionally, the historic Peabody Memorial Library has just been restored and renovated to serve as the repository for university archives and manuscript materials.

INTRODUCTION

The library staff at Sam Houston State University informed candidates for the position of library director of their dissatisfaction with the evaluation and merit system then (June, 1990) in use. This system had been the source of considerable staff dissatisfaction and ill-will for a number of reasons.

Much of the staff members' concern seemed to focus on the criteria expressed by the instrument compared to seemingly different criteria used by directors to make merit pay decisions. The results of staff evaluations, that is, were supposed to be used by directors as a basis for merit pay decisions but, staff believed, other factors

were considered because employees who were rated the highest did not always receive merit pay increases. Directors' decisions, therefore, seemed to be arbitrary and capricious, or based on other criteria.

Many staff also believed that the criteria for evaluation did not accurately reflect their job descriptions and skill requirements. Staff generally considered the criteria, therefore, to be unsatisfactory indicators of job performance.

Merit increase decisions were at library directors' discretion and depended on the adequacy of the library budget as there were no provisions for university-wide funding of merit. Consequently, there was little incentive for anyone to regard the process meaningfully. Above all else, the staff wanted the new Director to be above board and honest about the criteria and to follow policies and procedures which, hopefully, would be agreed upon.

Shortly after his arrival, the new Director (co-author) addressed these staff concerns and agreed that the evaluation and merit system needed to be modified and clarified. The Director established a Staff Council for the purpose of addressing staff concerns and functioning as the liaison between his office and the staff. The Council named a subcommittee to review the evaluation system and make recommendations to the staff and the Director. He hoped that this action would begin to erase some of the

poor morale that dissatisfaction with the merit system had helped to create.

THE "OLD" AND THE "NEW" SYSTEMS

The library Staff Council selected the evaluation review committee in October, 1990 based on two criteria: the individual's interest in the project, and representation of each major area within the library. Six committee members were named: two representing User Services, three from Technical Services, and the Systems Manager.

The committee met shortly after its appointment and elected a chair (co-author). At the first meeting, the members determined what preliminary work and research needed to be accomplished prior to assessment. The committee needed to define merit, identify staff concerns, agree upon its objectives, and research the topic by reviewing some of the pertinent literature.

Members of the committee, as well as the staff in general, agreed that a written evaluation instrument should be used in making merit decisions. There was almost no dissent regarding this type of documentation. All supervisors and staff would follow the same form and be evaluated on the same criteria.

A poll was taken in October, 1990 of the twenty-three Newton Gresham Library staff members. Of the twenty who responded, eighteen indicated that evaluations should be considered in merit decisions. The other two believed that evaluation instruments should not be the basis of merit decisions.

Merit system was defined as a system based on performance that was excellent; i.e. work that exceeded normally required standards and which deserved commendation. Because the overall performance of the staff was seen as generally very high, the committee looked for ways to distinguish exceptional performance. The committee agreed that job descriptions were a useful and necessary beginning point and all staff members should be asked to provide one to the committee. A comparison of these job descriptions would reveal the differences and similarities in requirements and skills. This comparison, along with considerable information which the staff provided verbally, gave a good sense of the diversity of criteria that needed to be incorporated into the new evaluation process.

Committee members obtained, read, and discussed both pertinent journal articles and evaluation instruments in use elsewhere. The articles were helpful but confirmed suspicions that questions and concerns about employee evaluation and merit systems would not be resolved easily or completely. Fairness, applicability, practicality,

appropriateness, and impossibility were discussed in many of the articles.

The committee studied instruments obtained from numerous sources. Several of the evaluation or appraisal forms that caught the committee members' attention used descriptive rating system for each criteria, though they varied in detail. The evaluation instrument used by nearby Stephen F. Austin State University (Nagadoches, Texas) was particularly helpful because descriptive job requirements and expectations were incorporated into the wording of the criteria. Another university included space for writing plans to correct performance problems. Members examined and liked an industrial appraisal instrument that combined two techniques of evaluating employees. A majority of the performance appraisal instruments discussed by the committee required satisfactory-unsatisfactory responses, as did the one the committee was revising (see Appendix A.)

Committee members agreed that unsatisfactory - satisfactory type of scales did not clarify performance criteria. This type of scale raised questions such as: What type of performance is satisfactory? When is quality of work unsatisfactory or above average? Is everyone evaluating their staff using the same criteria? The committee concluded that such scales unknowingly may have increased the possibility of rater bias, positive or negative, and resulted in at least the appearance of

arbitrary evaluations by library directors. The committee further agreed that undefined criteria such as loyalty should be excluded from the new evaluation process.

THE NEW EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The committee's first draft was developed in November, 1990 and distributed to library faculty and staff for feedback. Anyone could submit their feedback, verbal or written, to any member of the committee. Over the course of a number of meetings during the following two months, the committee refined the instrument and process as described below.

Each performance criteria has a rating scale of 1 to 5, with 5 representing the best possible performance. A weight system is included for each criterion which, when multiplied by the rating, provides a numerical score. The library staff and faculty liked and approved this rather mechanical concept with little modification. It seemed to bring some objectivity to a very subjective process.

The draft divided the instrument into two sections: general and job specific. A third section was added later (see Appendix B.) Section One contains criteria that applies to all positions in the library such as job knowledge, accuracy, punctuality, and ability to organize. Performance is broadly described in each statement. Each criterion in Section One has a set weight of 10 and applies

to everyone equally, regardless of responsibilities and duties.

The total possible score for Section One is 350. Score ranges represent levels of performance: 280 to 350 represents exceptional performance, 251 to 279 above average, and 210 to 250 satisfactory performance. Scores under 210 indicate a problem in employees' performance with respect to a specific aspect or criteria of the job.

Section Two is designed to be flexible and can be tailored to the job being evaluated in that each criteria can be given different weights. Staff members, in effect, design Section II individually by distributing weights to reflect their particular jobs. The total weights, however, must add up to 70. Section II, then, is weighted equally with (350 points each).

Employees do not have to assign weights to job functions that do not apply in Section Two. For example, a few employees do not make use of technology and would not assign any weight to this criterion. It is included, however, because all other positions involve the use of automation in some form: word processing, electronic mail, OCLC, electronic transfer of records to the online database, automated circulation, or the automated serials control system. Additional weight would have to be assigned to another criterion in such a way that the total

of all weight values in Section Two always add to 70 for each employee.

In January 1991 the Director asked the staff evaluation committee chair to discuss the draft appraisal instrument and process with library faculty. The committee chair told the faculty that the instrument was not, and was not intended to be, a scientific instrument. Its subjectiveness was accepted by both the faculty and staff because performance appraisals were thought to be subjective by their very nature.

Three major concerns were expressed by the library faculty. First, employees should not be able to assign weights only to those criteria on which they would score well. Second, the use of numerical scores would be misinterpreted by staff as failure if less than 280. Third, faculty wanted to be involved in setting weights in Section Two to assure that all applicable criteria would be assigned a weight value.

The staff committee subsequently modified the instrument and process in recognition of faculty concerns. The first and third concerns were addressed by requiring that weights be assigned months prior to the evaluation. Criteria then serve as evaluation points and as goals. Mutual agreement had been suggested as a solution in the faculty meeting and was incorporated to a limited extent by the staff committee. In the event supervisors disagree

with staff assigned weights, they are expected to reach agreement with the staff member. If the supervisor fails to achieve consensus, the staff assigned weight remains and the supervisors must attach an explanation which notes the disagreement.

The second concern was addressed by adding a provision that all applicable criteria must be assigned weights. They should be assigned in correspondence with their importance to the employee's overall job. This requirement is designed to prevent staff members from assigning greater weight to their best characteristics and less weight to their worst areas of performance. Employees who use OCLC and the Data Research Associates integrated system in cataloging, for example, should give more weight to use of technology because their primary responsibilities involve the use of these computer systems.

When first used, each classified staff member was solely responsible for assigning a weight value to each of the applicable criteria. Librarians, who supervised the staff members, however, clearly favored a consultative review of the weights assigned by their staff. Each supervisor (librarian) is required to reach agreement as to the weights with their subordinates. Librarians and staff agreed, further, that the assignment of weights should precede the actual evaluation conference by at least several months.

An addition to one of the instructional paragraphs was made made for clarification and to increase understanding of the scoring system. To help avoid the tendency for supervisors to inflate ratings, a statement was added which indicates that a score of 210 or above is considered satisfactory. The committee also added the requirement that ratings of a one or a five must be justified in writing by the supervisor. The Director hoped that this requirement might moderate the bias whereby supervisors thoughtlessly or carelessly overrate employees. This policy allows the Director to reject or investigate unsubstantiated very high or low evaluations by supervisors. Another benefit of documentation is that it allows the Director to distinguish between several exceptionally rated employees thereby making more informed merit pay decisions.

A balanced evaluation is expected as a result of including criteria that applies equally to all employees (Section One) and criteria that differs depending upon job descriptions (Section Two.) Balance, as well as impartiality, is achieved by requiring written justification of low and high ratings by the supervisor.

To gain additional information on which to distinguish merit, the Director asked the committee to add a third section in the next revision. Section Three consists of a page on which the employee is asked to note committees,

accomplishments, special training, workshops or seminars attended. If only a small percentage of the staff is able to receive merit raises, the Director feels that such information provides a means of deciding who is extraordinary. The committee concurred and this section is an integral part of the decision making process.

An assessment/decision making committee composed of the Director, the Associate Director, and the Assistant Director is used to bring a "balanced view," reduce the likelihood of arbitrary decision, and increase fairness. Because the number of staff and faculty is relatively small, work essentially within one building, and report directly or indirectly to the Director, Associate Director (Head of User Services), or Assistant Director (Head of Collection & Technical Services), the staff believe that the decision making process is fairer than the previous (director only) one. This library management group's responsibility will also include assessment of Section Three. This task may be significant because total evaluation scores are expected to be very close.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Director, the committee, and staff members met to discuss the final draft of the instrument and the evaluation process before implementation in February, 1991. At that time, the Director also asked that a peer-review evaluation based on the instrument developed by the

committee be considered. He explained how this may be implemented and that it may help to rectify one of the problems cited by staff: supervisors' lack of knowledge or familiarity with the details of the staff members' job requirements. After this peer review discussion, a staff vote approved the instrument itself but rejected peer review by a wide margin. Although the Director was comfortable with peer review, the staff was not.

The staff also made three recommendations to the Director. First, staff merit should be budgeted in order to raise morale and to acknowledge that the staff are important enough to include in the budget. Second, the committee recommended that the amount budgeted for merit be divided between individuals only to the extent that no award is less than $600.00 per year. Third, staff wanted the individual with the highest score to be awarded merit first, the next highest score awarded merit second, etc.

After using the new form and process in March, comments from staff were elicited. Although no merit was awarded this year due to a state-wide budget shortfall, the comments of staff were positive and included the following observations:

(1) The instrument is flexible enough to generally describe each job;

(2) The weighing system acknowledges that each employee knows the most about their job; and

(3) the inclusion of a list of accomplishments recognizes the importance of staff development and the ability of the individual to contribute to the well-being of the library, the university, and the community.

These comments showed that the staff generally accepted the new system. There were, however, two dominant criticisms:

(1) There is little value in having an appraisal system when there is little or no money for merit; and

(2) some of the criteria were too closely related to each other.

These comments did raise important issues which the Director discussed with the staff. The first was the Director's belief that performance review has intrinsic value and should not be tied to budget. The primary intent of evaluation should be both to improve performance and to recognize excellence on a personal level. This concept was accepted by the staff even though the budget, already set, did not include merit.

The merit system, however, is intended to reward exceptional performance and is directly related to budget. Time and repeated use of the system will be required before we know how well both the instrument (Appendix B) and the system works.

A survey to evaluate how the library faculty and staff

perceive the new merit appraisal system and how it compares to the previous system was made during the Fall Semester, 1991. Only those librarians and library staff who had been employed by the library longer than eighteen months participated in this survey. Out of the possible respondents, only five staff and six faculty responded to the survey.

This disappointing response rate was due, in part, to the fact that a State freeze on merit was in effect until sometime in 1992. Despite this, the staff and supervisors had some incentive to complete the evaluations because the Director assured employees that the evaluations will be used in future evaluations in an additive manner. Response to the survey was low because it was undertaken at an exceptionally busy time. Staff were busier than usual, too, because of a low student assistant budget. Staff felt that they had already spent perhaps too much time reviewing and discussing the evaluation system. Due to the poor response rate, it is not wise to draw too many conclusions from the data analysis.

Four questions were asked. Participants were asked to respond to each question by marking where in the continuum, from one to seven, between two antonyms their feeling was best expressed. A 4 rating was interpreted as neutral on this particular scale. This survey technique used the semantic differential scale.

The first question was as follows: *Compared to the old system of employee evaluation, what do you think of the revised instrument?* Participants marked a number between 1 and 7 between the two antonyms which included the following:

good - bad
valuable - worthless
concise - obscure
meaningful - meaningless
important - unimportant
positive - negative
fair - unfair
thorough - incomplete.

The other three questions and descriptors (antonyms) were similar. For the most part, there were few neutral responses to any of the questions except the last and responses favored the new evaluation system by far.

With respect to the first question comparing the old and revised system or process, one staff member responded that the issue was meaningless (7) and unimportant (5). With the exception of two neutral responses to good - bad and fair - unfair scales, all other library faculty and staff responded very favorably (1, 2, or 3).

The data shows very similar results for a question that asked respondents to indicate whether the revised instrument itself is good - bad, valuable - invaluable, etc. Again, the meaningfulness and importance of the revised merit instrument was questioned, supposedly because the likelihood of actual merit dollars was very doubtful at the time. Except for one neutral staff rating, all the faculty and staff expressed high scores (good, valuable, meaningful, important, positive, and fair) for the revised form.

Remembering that the revised merit process (with all three sections) has not yet been used, the employees surveyed were asked to compare the manner in which merit decisions had been made in the past (by directors alone) with the proposed, revised method (Director, Associate Director, and Assistant Director together). With the exception of one faculty member who expressed neutrality (4) on nearly all scales and two who did not respond to the question, responses were very favorable.

In summary, most of the faculty that responded felt positively about both the new instrument and the new process. One faculty member felt positively about the instrument but neutral about the committee decision-making process.

It is more difficult to determine the feelings of staff because so few responded. Those who did, however, were generally positive as well. We suspect from the informal feedback that the majority of the staff were also favorably disposed toward the revised instrument and process but did not want to take the time to respond or chose not to express their concern about the lack of budget for merit raises.

At a meeting with the library staff in January, 1992, the Director announced that it was possible to award merit pay increases to at least two staff members as recommended by the staff several months earlier. At the same time, however, he explained several misgivings about doing so and asked for a vote in favor of awarding merit, or not. The first misgiving concerned the likely ill-will that would result. A staff member who had been awarded merit several years ago confirmed the likelihood of resentment and ill-will. The Director also explained that there were budgetary trade-offs to be made in order to fund merit. The most critical impact was not being able to fund additional student assistant hours, particularly in stack maintenance and interlibrary loan.

Staff requested that a straw vote be taken to determine staff preferences between merit awards and increased student assistant budget. The vote was overwhelmingly in favor of no merit so long as an increase

in the number of student assistant hours occurred. Two probable explanations were offered for the vote outcome. One, all staff at the university had just received significant raises which mitigated the urgency with which individuals wanted merit, and two, that merit awards would be divisive and cause ill will between staff members. Regardless of the reason for the vote result, staff merit increases will not be awarded this year at the request of the staff.

SUMMARY

Because of the library staff members' dissatisfaction with the evaluation and merit system at Sam Houston State University, the newly appointed Director in 1990 set in motion a review and revision of the system. This included forming a committee of staff who worked with the Director and drafted an instrument and evaluation process in use since 1991.

This article describes the discussions leading to an instrument composed of three sections: Section One in which all job criteria apply to all staff and receive equal weights of ten each for a total of 350; Section Two in which staff weight only those criteria that apply to their jobs, and Section Three in which the staff note accomplishments, committees, training, and workshops attended.

The final score is calculated easily by adding the scores on Sections One and Two. Library management, however, must factor in the staff members' individual accomplishments. participation in library or university committees, etc. Although points cannot be assigned to such factors and this prevents a completely "automatic" decision based on simple addition of all scores, a survey of many of the faculty and staff indicated considerable satisfaction with the new system, particularly compared to the old one. Generally, staff members morale seems to have improved in regards to how they are regarded in terms of merit. We believe that a more positive attitude toward evaluation exists because the staff were highly involved in the entire process and feel a sense of ownership, whereas the supervisors (librarians) mostly responded and offered suggestions, Nonetheless, all comments and suggestions were listened to and evaluated. The authors, therefore, commend not only our evaluation system but also the process used in developing it to our readers.

APPENDIX A

THE "OLD" STAFF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Note: The format of the original staff evaluation instrument has been modified slightly here due to its conversion to Word Perfect. The content, however, has not been changed in any way.

Appendix A

NEWTON GRESHAM LIBRARY

SUPPORT STAFF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Sections I, II, and III are to be completed by the employee and returned to his/her immediate supervisor. The immediate supervisor is to complete sections IV and V and review these sections with the employee.

Name_____ Department_____

Payroll Title_____ Date Hired_____

Time in present job_____

Supervisor_____ Date of Last Review_____

I. JOB DESCRIPTION. Attach your job description to the back of this form.

II. ACHIEVEMENTS or CONTRIBUTIONS. Indicate contributions beyond normal job duties. Indicate achievements during the period under review.

III. FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND GOALS. Indicate areas within your department and/or your position which may need improvement and, if possible, suggest ways to achieve these improvements.

Rate employee's performance in each of the following areas by circling the appropriate number.

A. JOB PERFORMANCE FACTORS: (25% - 75%) _____

Quality of Work: accuracy, thoroughness, neatness; application of knowledge and skills.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Quantity of Work
amount of work completed; speed

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Organization of Work
analyzes and organizes work well; budgets time appropriately.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Job Knowledge
basic knowledge and skills, understanding of specific job duties and familiarity with other job functions.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

B. FACTORS AFFECTING JOB PERFORMANCE: (25% - 75%) _____

Dependability
prompt accomplishment of duties; punctuality; adherence to schedule; follow-through; reliability.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Initiative
ability to think creatively; imagination; resourcefulness; needs little supervision.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Attitude
interested in job, eager to improve; strives to constructively support the library.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Adaptability
learns new duties and adjusts to new situations.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Communication
effectively presents facts and ideas both orally and in writing; keeps his/her superiors and others informed of pertinent matters.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comment:

Relationship with Others
effectively works and deals with others, including co-workers, superiors, and others.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Policy
understands and follows University policy and procedures.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Responsibility
willingness to assume accountability for assigned tasks.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Punctuality and Attendance
seldom tardy or absent; careful to observe approved length of lunch periods and breaks.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent
6. Non-applicable

Comments:

Enhancements: involvement in committees, councils and work-shops; development of policies and procedures, and facilities and other library supportive activities.

Comments:

C. SUPERVISORY QUALITIES (if apply): (0%-50%) _____

Management of Unit
has well-organized, well-maintained, unit; is alert to labor-saving methods; delegates tasks wisely.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent

Comments:

Staff Relations
trains, directs, and develops subordinates, maintains good morale discipline, makes good judgements.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent

Comments:

Public Relations
maintains good public relations; communicates effectively with patrons (by phone, in person or both).

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent

Comments:

Problem-Solving
has ability to analyze problems; uses imagination in solving problems; makes sound suggestion and good decisions.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent

Comments:

Leadership
has ability to carry through ideas and improvements; ability to inspire others; confidence, courage, respect of others.

1. Unsatisfactory
2. Needs improvement
3. Satisfactory
4. More than satisfactory
5. Excellent

Comments:

If you feel there is something that people under your supervision should be evaluated on which is not covered in this form, please use this space to write the evaluation in.

An evaluation conference was held on _____ 19__.

Signatures: Employee_____

Immediate Supervisor_____

Department Head_____

APPENDIX B

THE "NEW" STAFF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Note: The spacing or format of the original has been modified slightly in order to accommodate publishing or Word Perfect requirements. The content, however, has not been modified.

Appendix B

SUPPORT STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM

SPECIFIC PURPOSE

**To clearly state the standard and criteria to be used in measuring support staff performance.
**To facilitate a professional relationship between supervisor and support staff.
**To provide criteria by which merit increases will be decided.
**To provide criteria to be used in decisions of retention and/or promotion.

MERIT

Scores of 210 to 250 for each section are considered representative of a satisfactory job performance, and scores of 251 to 279 for each section represent above average performance. Scores of 280 and above for each section are considered meritorious performance and will be considered for a merit award. As defined by University Personnel Policy, merit may be awarded when job performance and productivity is consistently above that normally expected or required.

SCALES

Each criteria contains five responses that range in point value from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent) with 3 being an adequate performance.

There is a weighing value used with each criteria as well. The criteria contained in the first section apply to and are important to all positions, so a weight value has been assigned. The criteria in the second section should be assigned a weight value by the support staff member being evaluated. Should the supervisor have a reservation about the weight value assigned by the staff member, that should be noted in the comment section of that criteria.

COMMENTS SECTION

The support staff member whose performance is being appraised may attach a separate sheet listing all committee membership, workshops, seminars, personal reading, etc. Supervisors must provide a written justification for ratings of excellence (5) in the Comments Section. It is requested that the explanation include examples of superior performance. If the space provided for comments is inadequate, please attach any additional papers to the end of the appraisal.

NAME _____ **DATE** _____

JOB TITLE _____ **SUPERVISOR** _____

DEPARTMENT _____ **HELD POSITION SINCE** _____

SECTION I

A. Knowledge of responsibilities of the position

5 Understands all responsibilities, has mastered job and improved skills
4 Understands most responsibilities, has mastered most duties
3 Adequately understands the duties necessary
2 Has poor knowledge of several responsibilities
1 Lacks understanding of job and duties required

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

B. Quality of work: to include accuracy and completeness

5 Work is consistently thorough, accurate,and efficient.
4 Work is accurate and complete.
3 Usually accurate, usually complete
2 Frequently inaccurate and incomplete
1 Is inaccurate, rarely complete

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

C. Amount of work done during the workday

5 Produces consistently high volume of work, extremely productive and fast.
4 Amount of work frequently above that expected
3 Amount meets job requirements; when situation requires production increases
2 Amount is generally below what is expected, does just enough to get by.
1 Minimum requirements not met, amount of work generally unsatisfactory

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

D. Adherence to agreed upon working hours

5 Prompt, rarely absent
4 Rarely late, seldom absent
3 Almost always on time, sometimes absent
2 Frequently late, often absent
1 Abuses leave

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

E. Ability to act independently and take the initiative

5 Little or no supervision necessary
4 Minimum supervision necessary
3 Normal supervision necessary
2 Frequent supervision necessary
1 Unable to function in position independently

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

F. Ability to organize, prioritized and schedule time

5 Extremely capable in coordinating tasks in changing situation
4 Schedules well, deals with changing situations
3 Is able to meet deadlines
2 Has difficulty prioritizing tasks
1 Ineffectively plans and schedules

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

G. Working relationship with other employees

5 Always cooperative, works exceptionally well with others
4 Works effectively with others
3 Works with others adequately
2 Sometimes works effectively with others
1 Unable to work with others

Weight value 10
Score (1-5 x 10) _____

Total score Section I _____

SECTION II

Instructions: The employee being appraised should indicate next to the 'weight value' how important that portion is to his or her job. The total weight value for this section must equal 70. If a category is not applicable to the job being appraised, place 'NA' on the weight value line.

A. Relations with patrons

5 Goes out of way to promote good interpersonal relations, very cooperative
4 Always considerate, patient and helpful
3 Usually considerate, patient and helpful
2 Is often inconsiderate, impatient and unhelpful
1 Is inconsiderate, impatient and unhelpful

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

B. Ability to develop and implement more efficient procedures

5 Develops and implements more efficient procedures
4 Seeks ways to expand knowledge of duties
3 Utilizes existing procedures efficiently
2 Shows little interest in developing more efficiency
1 Does not exhibit interest in new developments or information

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

C. Ability and willingness to work co-operatively

5 Actively recognizes contributions of others, encourages teamwork
4 Good teamworker, recognizes input of others
3 Works well with others
2 Seldom willing to work with others
1 Is unable to work with others

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

D. Ability to communicate facts and ideas well (written or verbal)

5 Exceptional communication skills
4 Communicates well, is concise and effective
3 Adequate communication skills
2 Frequently has difficulty communicating effectively
1 Unable to communicate

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

E. Ability to train others with regard to policies and procedures

5 Consistently trains others efficiently and well
4 Frequently trains others efficiently and well
3 Is able to trains others
2 Has difficulty training others
1 Is unable to train others

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

F. Ability to work with technology

5 Is exceptionally knowledgeable and skillful
4 Has above average knowledge and skills
3 Has adequate knowledge and applies it
2 Has little knowledge and few skills
1 Has no knowledge, unwilling to acquire skills

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

G. Possesses Supervisory skills, organization,

5 Consistently well organized and gives direction effectively
4 Usually well organized and able to give direction
3 Adequately organized and able to give direction
2 Somewhat organized and willing to give direction
1 Disorganized and unable to give direction

Weight value _____
Score (1-5 x weight value) _____

Total score Section II _____

COMMENTS:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

An employee appraisal conference was held on

_____, 19__ , at which time a copy was

provided to the employee.

Score Section I _____
Score Section II _____

Signatures:

Employee_____

Immediate Supervisor_____